

Adelaide Institute

ISSN 1440-9828
March 2003
No 187

New Zealand: The Crucifixion of Joel Hayward

K R Bolton

If nothing else the unceasing persecution of military historian Dr Joel Hayward indicates that no matter how insignificant the country and how small its Jewish population, Zionists can mobilise sufficient clout to ruin the career of a widely respected academic.

The Hayward affair also demonstrates the modern application of the ancient Judaic code of “never forgive, never forget”. If Jews continue to celebrate the death of one of their mythic enemies, Haman, 2500 years after the event, Joel Hayward is not about to be let off the hook any time soon, no matter how much he retracts and apologises and tries to make amends or simply stays silent. [1]

After all, Hayward’s thought crime, which has seen him driven from academe, has been to blaspheme against one of Judaism’s most holy dogmas — the Holocaust.

Worst still, Hayward was once the blue-eyed boy of anti-revisionism in New Zealand. In 1991 he co-founded a group entitled Opposition to Anti-Semitism Inc., the need of which in this country is difficult to determine. That year he wrote an article on Holocaust revisionism in New Zealand for *Without Prejudice*, a magazine published by the Australian Institute for Jewish Affairs. Hayward attempted to show the existence of Holocaust revisionism in New Zealand citing several organisations and publishers, but the evidence was pretty thin on the ground. However, unlike another contributor to that issue of “Without Prejudice”, Jeremy Jones, who has been the chief litigant against Dr Fredrick Töben in the Zionist crusade to get the website of Töben’s Adelaide Institute closed, Hayward concluded by stating that revisionist literature should not be banned but should be answered by Jewish educational efforts. [2]

In 1991 also Hayward, then a tutor and post-graduate history student at Canterbury according to a biographical note in *Without Prejudice*, began his MA thesis *The Fate of Jews in German Hands*. This was soon transformed into a history of Holocaust revisionism as indicated by the subtitle that was added: “An historical enquiry into the significance of revisionism”. The thesis was completed in 1993 and gained Hayward, subsequently to achieve a doctorate, an MA with A+ First Class Honours.

Hayward had a change of heart regarding revisionism during 1992. That year he informed his colleagues of the Organisation Against Anti-Semitism that during the course of his study he had found principal elements in the Holocaust allegation untenable, in particular gassing with Zyklon B and that he intended stating this in his thesis. [3] The main influence now seems to have been the Leuchter Report, although Hayward had already mentioned Leuchter disparagingly in his 1991 article in *Without Prejudice*.

The thesis itself is over three hundred pages long. Indeed, one of the major criticisms of the thesis is that it is too long for an MA. Both of Hayward's examiners Dr Vincent Orange and Dr J H Jensen, were to mention that the thesis is of doctoral standard, although Jensen had reservations about the length. Nonetheless what infuriates the Zionists is that two eminent academics both found the thesis to merit First Class Honours with an A+.

Dr Orange, Hayward's internal examiner, stated in his assessment of the thesis that Hayward "has used an exceptional range of sources... these sources have been thoroughly mastered and skilfully woven together. He argues cogently.... and consistently strives to achieve a balanced judgement." Dr Orange even stated that Hayward at times seems to go too far in trying to be fair to "all opinions". "Overall, his thesis amply supports the award of First Class Honours." [4]

Dr J H Jensen, Hayward's external examiner, stated that Hayward's conclusion is "careful, detailed, fair and exceptionally well-argued." Hayward is commended for "coolly judging the merits of the evidence and the argument on all sides in this debate." Again, like Orange, Jensen considers Hayward to have been too fair. His major criticism however is as to the length of the thesis. Jensen recommends marking the thesis at "the high end of the A+ range... a mark somewhere in the 88 to 90% area." Even here, ominously, Jensen writes: "...and I wish him courage to face the ostracism and suppression which will probably come his way." [5]

In 1993 Hayward appears to have found it prudent to write an anti-revisionist piece for the NZ *Jewish Chronicle*. The article deals with Kristallnacht. [6]

That year also Hayward placed an embargo on the thesis although giving copies to Prof. Faurisson, the US based Institute for Historical Review and David Irving, and to Dr Toben of the Adelaide Institute in 1998. It seems reasonable that he did so in gratitude for the material they had given him in preparing the thesis. The embargo was requested after Hayward received information that the thesis would be stolen from the University Library. However after the embargo was lifted in 1999 the thesis was copied by an unknown person at the University Library although it was not library policy to allow theses to be copied there. "A copy found its way to the NZ Jewish Council." On 2 October 1999 Hayward received the first of many e-mails from Prof. Bing stating how shocked he was by the conclusions of the thesis. Hayward was already receiving "nasty e-mails from anonymous persons". Worried by what actions the Zionists might take, Hayward requested the thesis be withdrawn from the Library. This was not deemed appropriate, however the Library appended Dr Hayward's one and a half page retraction [7]

Hayward's problems started in 1999 when the NZ Jewish Council obtained a copy of the thesis. By this time Hayward was a lecturer in military history at Massey University,

Palmerston North, and was responsible for establishing the department for military analysis at that institution.

The pro-active David Zwartz, chairman of the Jewish Council sought to have Dr Hayward's MA revoked.

Zwartz chose to confront Hayward with the thesis a month after publicity given to the Irving trial and to the frenzy surrounding a German student, Hans Kupka, studying at the University of Waikato, Hamilton.^[8]

Zwartz wrote to the University of Canterbury demanding that the thesis be withdrawn and that the degree awarded to Hayward be cancelled. Given that Hayward had since become a highly respected academic, senior lecturer in defence and strategic studies at Massey and an author ^[9], the demand was designed to ruin Hayward professionally. Zwartz stated the university was responsible for the thesis, for not having 'set Hayward straight'. ^[10]

Hayward for his part wrote to the *NZ Jewish Chronicle* stating that the thesis contained "several significant errors of fact." "In other words, I stuffed up." ^[11]

Of course nothing placates the Zionists and Taslmudists except the total destruction of their enemies, as in the days of the mythical Haman.. Hayward would have to be figuratively, if not literally, liquidated. Zwartz demanded an investigation as to why Hayward had been permitted to proceed with the thesis when a revisionist orientation had become apparent. Therefore, not only has Hayward been targeted but also Hayward's degree internal examiner, Dr Vincent Orange, and Dr J H Jensen, the external examiner, particularly since, as it is continually reiterated, neither have retracted their high regard for the thesis. .

In order to placate the Jewish Council Hayward provided a one and a half page addendum repudiating the pro-revisionist conclusions^[12]. This, and Hayward's apology published in the Jewish Chronicle of course did not placate the Zionists. The University of Canterbury therefore set up a working party of "three eminent persons" to enquire into the circumstances surrounding the approval of the thesis topic and as to whether Hayward's MA could be revoked.

The three eminent persons were Hon Sir Ian Barker QC, former Chancellor of the University of Auckland and former High Court Judge; Emeritus Prof. Ann Trotter, former Prof. of History and Assistant Vice-Chancellor, University of Otago; Stuart Macintyre, professor of History and Dean of the Faculty of arts, University of Melbourne. What made these three particularly qualified to criticise the opinions of two eminent NZ historians, Orange and Vincent, is unclear. However, they were at pains to accept rather uncritically the opinions of Prof. Richard Evans in his submission on behalf of the Jewish Council

After five months the working party came out with a weighty (in terms of pages) report that had cost an outrageous \$200,000. The conclusions were that Dr Hayward had not merited an MA with First Class Honours. However, unfortunately for the Zionists the committee, after seeking legal advice, found that there was no legitimate way in which Hayward's degree could be revoked. The committee found that although Hayward had demonstrated superior abilities as a researcher and had put together his thesis with

exceptional skill, his conclusions were flawed. . He should not have offered an opinion as to the weight of evidence. Also castigated were Hayward's examiners Orange and Jensen.

The report considered Hayward's thesis in detail, relying on the submission of Prof. Evans. Based on Evans' submission, the working party criticises Hayward for not giving prime importance to the alleged backgrounds and motivations of the revisionist, and criticises him for giving scholarly credentials to the Institute for Historical Review, which in the learned committee's opinion is "pseudo-scholarly" and a front for extremism. One must assume, given that the IHR board does indeed include bona fide academics for the most part, that the only academics the committee would consider relevant are historians. As to the alleged political associations, one wonders whether this tribunal would have the same suspicions against academics with a Left-wing orientation? Would they question the scholarship and objectivity of Left-wing academics who for example, seek to give credibility to their political positions on racial equality or the primacy of environment over heredity in determining intelligence? Or would they regard any such suspicions as "McCarthyism?"

The committee is critical of Hayward for utilising detailed analysis on the technicalities of using diesel fumes for mass gassing in alleged gas vans. It is apparent from the report that the working party was simply overwhelmed by the evidence so it chose not only to ignore the evidence but to castigate Hayward for using it since he was not qualified in that area. Yet how is one to write a historiography of revisionism with examining the technical questions? Certainly they have long been a major factor in the debate.

The committee follows the Zionist line in obediently castigating Hayward's examiners, for it is their eminence which has really given academic credibility to revisionist conclusions. Prof. Jensen, the external examiner, is an authority on World War II and Eastern European history. Dr Vincent Orange also a highly regarded scholar on World War II, was a senior Ph.D lecturer at Canterbury University.

Yet both these scholars had their reputations tarnished by a committee themselves devoid of credentials to pass judgement on the reputations of Orange and Jensen. Rather than the opinions of two reputable New Zealand academics, independently arrived at, the committee preferred the submission of Prof. Evans, head of the chair of German history at Cambridge, written at the request of the NZ Jewish Council. Evans had been chief expert defence witness at the libel suit brought by David Irving against Penguin Books and Prof. Lipstadt. His performance during that trial seems to have been polemical rather than scholarly, and even the working party notes that Evans was polemical and emotional on certain points.

Despite the opinions of Orange and Jensen, the tribunal opined that the thesis "did not deserve the highest accolade". Therefore the reputations of Jensen and Orange were tarnished to appease Zionist pressure.

The working party recommended that the University of Canterbury make a number of procedural changes so that nothing so heretical will occur again, and that there be established a Human Ethics Committee to screen thesis topics. The University should apologise to the Jewish Council for "hurt." The university should work with the Jewish

Council, consider offering a paper on Jewish studies and sponsor an annual lecture to raise Holocaust awareness.

The working part report is itself 89 pages. There follow 29 appendices.

Of course Hayward's apology and retraction and the working party's recommendations were not sufficient for the Jewish Council. Mike Regan, editor of the *NZ Jewish Chronicle* even headlined his editorial on the working party's findings "an odious decision", because the party couldn't find any legal way by which Hayward's degree could be revoked.[\[13\]](#) .

Neither are the Zionists happy that Orange and Jensen could not be destroyed. Indeed, Orange has continued to defend his opinion of Haywards' thesis. Zwartz was "disappointed" with the outcome of the enquiry.

Dov Bing continues his vendetta having successfully helped hound out of New Zealand Kupka, an achievement of which the *Jewish Chronicle* continues to boast. He has claimed in the *NZ Jewish Chronicle* that Hayward whilst teaching at Massey, was still recommending the books of David Irving. In an article on Hayward in 2001 Bing was asking – in a quite unprofessional manner for a fellow academic – what kind of message Hayward might be sending his students at Massey.[\[14\]](#) Of concern also was Hayward's position as a lecturer before the NZ Officer Cadet School, Royal NZ Air Force's Command & staff College and officers of the Royal NZ Navy. Bing questioned as to why Massey had promoted Hayward as a senior lecturer, and wondered aloud who Hayward's referees were for his appointment to the university faculty in 1996. If they could be identified they would certainly be harassed and disgraced. Hence, the Zionists had shifted their attention from Canterbury to Massey, having already successfully bullied both Canterbury and Waikato. [\[15\]](#)

Despite Hayward's repudiation of his own thesis and his public apologies nothing will satisfy the descendants of Esther and old Mordecai once someone has crossed the power of Zion.

The Zionists have successfully ended Hayward's career in academe. Apparently the pressure was such that he – with a family to consider – suffered a nervous breakdown and has withdrawn from his scholarly profession. However, the Jewish Council is far from satisfied. There still remains the fact that the thesis was granted academic credibility and indeed First Class Honours and has not been revoked. There is also the irksome attitudes of the two eminent scholars who were Hayward's degree examiners, who have still not felt obliged, despite the pressure, to condemn Hayward's thesis.

Therefore another wave of media smear-mongering appeared in November 2002, with Philip Matthews drawing heavily on the omnipresent Dov Bing for an article entitled "In Denial" appearing in the *NZ Listener*.[\[16\]](#)

Matthews introduces the latest anti-Hayward smear by way of David Irving's lost battle against Penguin Books, Deborah Lipstadt and their multi-million dollar backers. Hayward's thesis is said to be "a leading piece of ammunition" for Irving and other so-called "Holocaust deniers". Matthews was able to get Hayward to talk with him. He

reiterates his oft stated response that he made “errors” and “wishes he could turn the clock back”.

Matthews attempts to bolster the argument of Dov Bing et al that Hayward continued to be associated with Holocaust revisionism until quite recently. He cites another Canterbury University thesis, this one on the Nuremberg trials, written by Stephen Eaton. An apparently unrepentant Prof. Orange also supervised this thesis. Hayward claims that he had never heard of Eaton or had any knowledge of the thesis, yet Eaton states in his acknowledgements that Hayward proof-read and critiqued the text.

Matthews states that Hayward resigned from Massey in June 2002, and has not pursued an academic. Hayward states to Matthews that he had left Massey “to recover my shattered emotional health after suffering a nervous breakdown caused by acute stress and depression about this dreadful saga.” Hayward continues:

“I received literally scores of abusive letters and threats, including death threats. I must add that I received worse treatment, and had my freedom and privacy violated to a worse degree, than if I had committed an armed robbery.

“I also wanted to find a new career, one that would free me artistically and creatively. I no longer believe that all staff within New Zealand universities care about freedom of inquiry and expression. Many teachers encourage extreme political correctness and enforce conformity of ideas and they discourage free thinking. But that’s also typical in a wider Western society, isn’t it? I’m a liberal democrat, so freedom is important to me. Maybe that’s why I feel so sad about what I see as the decline of academic freedom in New Zealand. And of course I’m talking generally, not about my own painful circumstances.”

However, Matthews goes after the individual who has probably always been the real target of the Zionists, who has been the most stalwart, Dr Vincent Orange. Matthews states that he is the person who is probably really being “protected” by the University’s unwillingness to revoke Hayward’s degree (quite apart from there being no legal grounds for doing so?). Matthews states that Orange joined the faculty 40 years ago, and that he was due to retire at the end of 2002. Matthews quotes the verdict of Justice Gray in the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial that “no objective fair-minded historian would have serious cause to doubt that there were gas chambers at Auschwitz.” Matthews adds “It was Orange who did just that.” Auckland University academic, Christian Leitz is then quoted as stating that the onus is on the supervisor to ensure a student doesn’t get pulled in a certain direction when writing on a contentious topic. “In most institutions, this would have been the end of somebody’s career.”

Dr Orange for his part rode the storm bravely, and as far as is known, concluded his long academic career with distinction and continues to have his books on military history published. Matthews states that on the eve of publication of the *Listener* Orange broke his silence and released a letter he had written to Canterbury’s chancellor on 20 April 2001. Orange in the letter accepts responsibility for the situation Hayward finds himself. Orange states, in an obvious attempt to defend his friend and deflect some of the hostility, that he failed to offer adequate supervision during most of 1992 while he was on leave. He adds: “and yet: how much of Joel’s apprentice work has withstood that intense, protracted and generally hostile scrutiny!”

Orange also describes “Mr Zwartz and his associates” as “not ‘men of probity’.” Orange is also

disparaging of the Zionist’s beloved Prof Evans stating that Evans’ expert report is “hostile and often incorrect”.

Following up the article Hayward wrote a letter to the *Listener* mentioning that as a gesture of goodwill to his persecutors he gave his large and expensive collection of Third Reich books, sources and microfilms to the Mazal Research Library in the USA, “a centre that counters anti-Semitism and Holocaust denial.” He concludes: “I have to be able to move on in life without further smears. I am not a ‘story’; I am an average kiwi man with a loved and loving family. We deserve the same privacy and freedom from hassles that every other citizen gets.” [\[17\]](#)

With the replacement of vice-chancellor Daryl Le Grew this year, the Jewish Council has renewed hope that the degree might still be withdrawn. Matthews concludes his article by quoting from Evans’ report that there is a precedent with the revoking of Henri Roques Ph.D. in France,. “It should happen in the case of Joel Hayward, too.” [18](#)

Although both Hayward and Orange have departed from academe, Zion is still not sufficiently avenged. What remains is to destroy the writing career of them both

[\[1\]](#) One of the principal Jewish celebrations is Purim, a feast day accompanied by frenzied dancing and often intoxication. It celebrates the deaths of those who stand up to Jewish aspirations. The origins are to be found in the Book of Esther in the Old Testament, which describes the elimination of Haman, principal minister to the King of Persia, along with not only his 10 sons but also 75,000 other Persians (Esther 9:15). The reason for the extermination of these thousands is unexplained. Purim is to remind Jews, 2500 years after the supposed hanging of Haman and his sons that Jewry is ever mindful of those who cross them. Interestingly the Nuremberg defendants sentenced to death were hanged on Purim, an event remarked upon by Julius Streicher as he mounted the gallows.

[\[2\]](#) Joel Hayward, Holocaust Revisionism in New Zealand – the ‘Thinking Man’s anti-Semitism?’, *Without Prejudice*, Australian Institute of Jewish Affairs, no. 4, December 1991. Perhaps Hayward was attempting to justify the existence of his Organisation Against Anti-Semitism in a country where none exists? Interestingly the Advisory Board of the magazine includes Dr Paul Spoonley, a sociologist at Massey University. Spoonley has created a reputation for himself as an expert on the extreme Right in New Zealand and is called upon by the news media whenever some sensationalistic journalism on the subject requires a bit of substance. Unfortunately, Spoonley does not seem to have undertaken any further research since his 1987 book *The Politics of Nostalgia – Racism and the Extreme Right in NZ*. That there is no extreme Right in NZ does not however deter either Spoonley or the media from attempting to expose an impending threat.

[\[3\]](#) Kingsley McFarlane wrote to the Registrar of Canterbury University on 5 May 1992 attempting to thwart Hayward’s thesis. Hayward had been secretly filmed during the course of a discussion he had had with his former OAS colleagues, and McFarlane sought to use Hayward’s statements against him. Prof W D McIntyre, Head of the History Dept. found the interference “intolerable” and even then (25 May) describes the “persecution”

(sic) of Hayward. The correspondence between the university and the OAS are reprinted as appendix I in the *Joel Hayward Working Party Report*, Canterbury University, December 2000, set up to appease the NZ Jewish Council. (See below).

[4] Dr Vincent Orange, Appendix L of the Working Party Report. Orange has remained a friend of Hayward's, and unlike Hayward has never repudiated his opinions on the thesis. Orange was Reader in History at Canterbury until his recent retirement, and is a noted author on military history.

[5] J H Jensen is a Professor of History. His assessment appears as Appendix M of the working Party Report. Like Orange, he has refused to repudiate his high opinion of the thesis, despite Hayward's own retractions.

[6] Joel Hayward, Irving admits Hitler knew of Kristallnacht. NZ Jewish Chronicle, December 1993.

[7] Working Party Report, p. 29, 2.46-47. The main point of contention of the appended retraction is that Hayward claims that new information had since come to light repudiating Leuchter. This is a puzzle to both Zionists and revisionists alike, and Hayward will not elaborate despite requests. The only repudiation of Leuchter has been the work of J C Pressac. Hayward spends a dozen pages considering Pressac and continues to deal with other writers appearing in the book *Truth prevails: demolishing holocaust denial: the end of The Leuchter Report*, jointly published by Holocaust Survivors and Friends in pursuit of Justice (NY) and The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation (Paris). Hayward calls the book "the most substantial attempt at specifically refuting" Leuchter. Hayward considers Pressac's arguments "flawed" and his ideas "preconceived". Hayward, in keeping with his objectivity, finds Leuchter to have 'miscalculated' and 'misinterpreted' on several points, but after weighing the pros and cons comes out decisively in favour of Leuchter. (Chapter IV, The Leuchter Affair). Hayward is also well aware of Pressac's Auschwitz: technique and operation of the gas chambers (NY, 1989) since it appears in his bibliography.

[8] Kupka was undertaking a thesis on the use of the German language in New Zealand. He is said to have been an official of the right-wing Republican Party in his native Germany, and there are conflicting claims about him being a so-called "Holocaust denier". It was claimed that Kupka's studies were likely to include interviewing "Holocaust survivors" and that this would be insensitive. Kupka replied that his thesis had nothing to do with interviewing "survivors" and that his opponents "are aware of this fact". (Evening Post, 20 April 2000). In a disgraceful display of intolerance and anti-German bigotry students and "Jewish academics" (as the Post article put it) protested against Kupka's presence making his situation untenable, and forcing his departure. At the centre of the protests were a coterie of Jewish students and faculty member Dov Bing, involved with the NZ Jewish Chronicle and a prime figure in the harassment of Hayward.

[9] Hayward's book *Stopped at Stalingrad* is a standard reference used by staff colleges and university defence study courses.

[10] Brent Edwards, Holocaust thesis draws fire, Evening Post, 13 April 2000.

[11] Hayward, "Dr Hayward apologises for 'mistakes I made as an inexperienced student'", letter to the editor, NZ Jewish Chronicle, April 2000.

[12] Hayward's addendum, dated 26 January 2000, appears in the Working Party Report as Appendix B.

[13] Mike Regan, *An Odious Decision*, NZ Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 2001.

[14] One could ask what type of pro-Zionist and pro-Israel message Bing gives his students at Waikato, particularly when that message involves harassment of a German student.

[15] Dov Bing, "Dr Hayward, the Holocaust and Massey University". NZ Jewish Chronicle, Feb. 2001. Bing is a member of the Waikato Jewish Association committee, which organised protests, including student demonstrations, against the hapless German student Kupka.

[16] Philip Matthews, "In Denial", NZ Listener, 2 November, 2002.

[17] Hayward, letters, *NZ Listener*, November 9, 2002.

[18] In 1983 the University of Göttingen, Germany, using a National Socialist law, withdrew a doctorate it had conferred upon Justice Wilhelm Stäglich during the 1950s. What was Stäglich's crime? He authored the now classic Revisionist text *Der Auschwitz Mythos* which the university deemed was not a worthy scholarly work.

Eugenics writ small from South Australia's Wagner Society.

Fredrick Töben

When I was imprisoned in Germany in 1999, a couple of Adelaide City Councillors wished to remove the 'Adelaide' from our Adelaide Institute – without success.

At the same time, a few committee members of the Richard Wagner Society of South Australia wished to expel me because I had allegedly disgraced the society's good name through my being arrested and imprisoned. A

staunch committee member strongly rejected such an expulsion on grounds that I was merely exercising my right to free speech. The notable Jewish influence within the Wagner Society failed to get its way perhaps because other members knew that Richard Wagner himself had 'done time' and was for a while constantly on the run, until the Bavarian King became his protector.

I mention this because in the latest Wagner Society Newsletter 159, March 2003, there is an article by former professor of German at The University of Adelaide, Brian Coghlan, wherein the eugenics debate receives a boost, albeit indirectly. Only the first paragraph of this article is reproduced below.

U-Oma Cosima, Ur-Opa Franz – and Nike Wagner in Weimar.

Nike Wagner is Wieland's daughter. Richard was thus her Uropa – great-grandfather. Even more impressive: Franz List, Cosima's father, was Nike's Uropa – her great-great-

grandfather; which is at the very least, just as important ... Wieland, Nike's father, was of course presiding genius and unrivalled innovator at Bayreuth from 1951 until his timely death in 1966. Nike's gene-pool is formidable, to say the least. Moreover, she bears an unmistakable resemblance to great-grandmother Cosima whose parents were Marie, Countess d'Agoult and of course Franz List. It is good to be reminded of this: the present Wagners are equally Liszt and Wagner; though Bayreuth zealots often ignore the fact.

A joke at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum?

Gay Focus At Holocaust Museum

Elizabeth Olson [and Töben's running commentary]

New York Times, 4 January 2003

Washington, Jan. 3 — They were called the "175ers — homosexuals that the Nazis arrested, beat, used as prison labor and sometimes castrated. Charges were brought under Paragraph 175 of the German criminal code, which outlawed "unnatural indecency" between men, starting in 1871. The Nazis broadened the statute to make "simple looking" and "simple touching" reasons for tracking and rounding up gay men.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum here, where two million visitors a year learn about the persecution of Jews under Hitler, has decided to focus exhibitions on other groups, beginning with homosexuals. For two years, the museum's researchers combed records, mainly in Germany. The somber result is "Nazi Persecution of Homosexuals, 1933-1945," an exhibition that is running through March 16 at the museum, at 100 Raoul Wallenberg Place SW, and will then travel to New York, San Francisco and other cities. (More information: www.ushmm.org)

[Oh, oh, the museum is beginning to recycle old worn-out material. Usually it is not good for business to have compulsion propelling individuals into the museum, as has been the case since it opened. Even law enforcement agencies pushed their new recruits through the doors; thereby spreading German hatred into impressionable minds, and that one day will backfire. Why? When the innocent awake!]

While tens of thousands were incarcerated and an unknown number killed,

[just like the 900,000 unregistered Jews gassed at Auschwitz?]

few homosexuals told their stories then — or later. For decades, after the Allied [all(l)ies?] victory they were subject to the same criminal statute that Hitler's regime had used to

pursue them. The law was expunged in 1994, and it was only last May that convicted "175ers" were pardoned by the German government.

[Most Australian states repealed their sodomy laws during the late 1960, early 1970s, with Tasmania coming up the rear, and only recently repealing its sodomy laws. This pattern reflected what was going on in the western world. Until ousted from power, the Taliban strictly enforced such laws as part of their strict application of Islamic law. The relationship between sodomy and paedophilia is now blurred, something those who advocate sexual harassment laws reluctantly admit.]

Only fragments of their brutal treatment in the Nazi era are known. Robert T Odeman, for example, who wrote cabaret songs, was convicted for homosexual offenses in Berlin and sent to prison. After he was released, police arrested him again, citing his letters to a half-Jewish friend. Mr Odeman was sent to a concentration camp, from which he and two others escaped in 1945.

[No doubt another one of those miraculous escapes, either because of German incompetence or because the whole penal system was falling apart as the war effort ground to a halt.]

He died in Berlin 40 years later without knowing that his story would be part of an effort to remember the Holocaust's other victims, who include not only gays but also the handicapped, Gypsies, Poles, Soviet prisoners of war and Jehovah's Witnesses.

[It will be interesting to watch the next few months as the USA gears up for a war effort in the Middle East, and how it will reflect on US territory. Already so-called Middle Eastern aliens have been subjected to humiliating treatment; this is not to even raise the spectre of how such were treated during WWI and WWII.]

Since there was so little testimony from the victims or the survivors,

[Fabrication and creation of illusions — the old smoke and mirror tricks explains why it is so dark in that museum — was the order of the day?]

the museum built the exhibition around disturbingly meticulous Nazi records. Photographs, cartoons and art from the era show that stamping out homosexuality became a priority for the Nazis even though an openly gay Ernst Röhm, chief of the storm troopers, helped bring Hitler to power.

[Wasn't Hitler's priority to exterminate the Jews? And what about the Nazi's massive innovations in all human endeavour that had nothing to do with persecution? Naturally, that's conveniently forgotten because it would mean opening up the archives to Revisionists. What about the German patents and inventions stolen by the All(l)ies after the war?]

In a country where bonding began early in all-male youth groups [hey we had boy scouts as well!], the Nazis publicly campaigned to stamp out "indecent" acts Yet "a considerable number of cases of homosexual activity were found in just about every part of the Nazi apparatus, from the storm troopers to the Hitler Youth movement," said Geoffrey Giles, a University of Florida historian, who contributed some of his research to the exhibition. While "deviant" acts were a convenient tool of denunciation in the Hitler Youth, where

homosexuality was cited for 25 percent of those expelled, there was also a fear that such behaviour was learned and could spread through the corps.

[To this day anyone guilty of 'moral turpitude' is not permitted to enter the USA, so according to the green card that every visitor to the US must sign! When will this item be repealed? The homosexual issue of whether it is learned or whether it is a genetic matter is still alive and well – and is as old as human nature itself because it underpins the problem of free will versus determinism as embedded within moral philosophy. By using the shut-up word 'homophobia', discussion is stifled, much like those other shut-up words, 'hate-speech', 'Holocaust denier', 'antisemite', 'racist', 'neo-Nazi', etc. This silencing mechanism is antithetical to the well-being of a vibrant democracy, and will inevitably lead to a dictatorship, the beginnings of which we see emerging from what is happening at the Holocaust Museum.]

Such behaviour had to be righted, the Nazis argued, because homosexuals were jeopardizing Germany's future generations by failing to have children. Lesbians, by contrast, were often spared, because they could be re-educated to assume roles as wives and mothers.

[Oh, this simplistic garbage hurts those who are aware of where this argument is going.]

In the Weimar Republic, courts restricted the 1871 law, which carried a sentence of two years' imprisonment, to acts of physical contact. About 400 people were convicted until the start of the Nazi era; then the number of convictions rose tenfold.

By 1936 the Gestapo leader Heinrich Himmler had established the Central Office to Combat Homosexuality and Abortions, and surveillance of gays was legalized. Over all, as many as 100,000 men were arrested and charged with homosexual acts. About half were convicted and imprisoned. Up to 15,000 were interned in concentration camps, where pink triangles – like the yellow Star of David that Jews had to wear – were sewn on their uniforms. Some prisoners wore both.

[Did anyone expect these tags to be glued on to the uniform? During my time in a German prison I had a green dot on my cell door because it indicated a vegetarian lunch; others had a red dot for a Moslem meal; still others had a blue dot that indicated the person in the cell was suicidal and thus could not be left alone in the cell. German thoroughness meant that prisoners needed to be classified. This classification may now seem odd and offensive – but it was not unusual. Many homosexuals were also imprisoned as they posed a security risk because their political loyalty lay elsewhere – war-time Britain played this card to its advantage.]

Despite Nazi zeal,

[Oh, here we go again – on the one hand we have a virtue, on the other hand stupidity!]

no law prevented homosexuals from serving in the German military. The Nazi Party feared

[what's this? The Nazis actually feared something or someone? This makes them human!]

that an exemption "could exclude as many as three million men," [not six million?] says Mr Giles, who is writing a book about homosexuals and the party. When World War II began, accused and convicted "175ers" could legally mingle in the ranks. About 7,000 were convicted but were forced to return to military service, where they were sometimes used in suicide missions on the front lines.

[Sort of like suicide bombers in military clothes?]

The Nazis distinguished between offenders who had "learned" their behaviour from others and the "incurables", who actively sought partners.

[I came across such an attitude as expressed here while imprisoned in Germany in 1999, when the prosecutor advised the court that he wished me to receive a two year four month sentence because it was obvious to him that the past seven months and one week had had no effect on me! Revisionists are incurables who refuse to see the error of their thinking, and like in the former Soviet Union are considered to be thought-criminals who do not deserve any sentence remissions for good behaviour.]

The so-called incurables were sent to concentration camps, and by 1943 camp commanders were given authority to castrate homosexuals. The exhibition includes a photograph of an operating table.

[Hey, this is a joke, right? An operating table to prove castrations took place? We asked the former director of the USHMM, M Behrenbaum why there was no Auschwitz's murder weapon on display, i.e. the homicidal gas chamber, and he replied, in writing, that there was no original available, but that the museum had included a 'door' from a gas chamber.]

"They believed that homosexuality could be corrected," said Edward J Phillips, the exhibition's curator. "That included hormone treatments among other experiments. Also, there was a notion that homosexuality was developmental and those forced to work in disciplined hard labor could overcome it."

[How modern this approach was because is evident from the fact that it existed throughout the western world until fairly recently. The comment could aptly be applied to sexually repressed USA until the late sixties when the drug culture re-orientated and re-focused public morality into consumerism writ large. Now we may add to that the other factor: the hunt for terrorists and the fight for freedom and democracy.]

Mr Odeman's case was unusual according to historians, because some of the songs and poems he wrote in the concentration camp showed that he was part of a supportive gay circle. One theory about why gays were treated so badly in the camps was that they were isolated by fear of associating with each (sic) other and so were easier prey for camp guards, Mr Giles said.

[What's this all about? On the one hand there was the freedom to have a support group active in the camp, and on the other hand there were the predatory guards? Something here remains unsaid — perhaps it would spoil the story, even reveal the exhibit is a massive beat-up because the museum is running out of steam.]

Why were the Nazis so diligently anti-homosexual?

[Were they, or is this another one of those stupid beat-ups before the expected fire storm in Iraq?]

There have been claims that Hitler was gay, but Mr Giles believes the Nazi focus on gays stemmed from close relationships among German men in wartime trenches.

[On Australian national television, Guido Knopp, et al, recently had their series on Hitler and his women screened, where it is suggested Hitler was quite a philanderer. The homosexual insinuation here indicates that what publicists are attempting to do is to smear Hitler's image by setting competing characteristics against one another. That the homosexual community is thereby slandered and defamed seems to escape those who brim with delight that Hitler had a possible 'homosexual'-flawed past!

When the British Queen Mother died, Australia's ABC TV Lateline featured a discussion between republican, Dr Gerard Henderson, and monarchist, Professor David Flint. The topic was a letter the Queen Mother had written wherein she refers to Hitler as "a sincere man". Henderson suffered from bodily and mental spasms as Flint deflected Henderson's criticism of the Queen Mother's remarks. Flint pointed out that even 'evil' Hitler could indeed have been quite a sincere person in the beliefs he held. The same Henderson 'syndrome' operates when someone is labelled with any or all of the above-listed shut-up words. For example, a 'racist' cannot have any positive attributes; most certainly a 'Holocaust denier', in the German judiciary's eyes, is someone who has lots of "criminal energy"!]

"The defining relationship for the older Nazis was World War I, and they set out in the 1920s to reproduce that feeling of comradeship," Mr Giles said. "But those relationships could stray into the homoerotic area, and that's what they feared."

[Wow, that is a most profound statement, and it leaves me speechless! Seriously though, to think that this intellectual structure, as revealed through this article, is the bedrock on which the exhibit rests could lead to despair. The dumbing down of America continues.

Ironically, a German court has recently sentenced a US trans-sexual to a hefty fine under the notorious Section 130 of the Penal Code that forbids doubting the 'Holocaust'. See at: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/Dissenters/doyle.htm>

[Top of Page](#) | [Home Page](#)

©-free 2003 Adelaide Institute